

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-12 remain in the application. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled. Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended. New claims 9-12 have been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method step as required by U.S. patent practice. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled. Additionally, claims 7 and 8 have been amended to particularly point out the claimed subject matter, specifically with regard to defining the reactive groups. Applicant submits that the remaining reaction conditions would be obvious to one of skill in the art and need not be included in the claims of the present application. Support for the above amendments can be found in the specification as originally filed, and more specifically can be found at least at paragraphs 49-58 of the published application. Applicants submit that claims 1-2, and 5-8 are now presented in accordance with 35 USC §112, second paragraph and it is requested that the 35 USC §112 rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 USC §101.

Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled, and therefore the 35 USC §101 rejection is rendered moot with regard to said claims. As stated above, claim 1 has been amended to recite proper method claim language and applicant submits that claims 1-2 are now properly presented in accordance with 35 USC §101, and therefore it is requested that the 35 USC §101 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Koike et al. (U.S. Published Patent Appl. No. 2005/0038258 A1).

Applicant's undersigned representative wishes to thank Examiner Haq for his time during the telephone call in which the Koike et al. reference was discussed. As determined in said telephone call, the Koike et al. reference is not prior art under 35

USC §102(e) because the Koike et al. reference was not published in English before the February 23, 2004 filing date of the present application. Because Koike et al. is not prior art under 35 USC §102(e), it is requested that the above 35 USC §102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Koike et al. (U.S. Published Patent Appl. No. 2005/0038258 A1).


As discussed above, the Koike et al. reference was not published in English before the February 23, 2004 filing date of the present application, and therefore the Koike et al. reference is not prior art under 35 USC §103(a). It is therefore requested that the Examiner withdraw the 35 USC §103 rejection.

New claims 9-12 have been added to further point out and specifically claim the subject matter of the present invention. No new matter has been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the present specification as filed and more specifically at least in paragraphs 49-58 of the published application.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-2 and 5-12 are now in proper form for allowance.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald E. Hespos, Esq.

Atty. Reg. No. 30,066

Customer No. 001218

CASELLA & HESPOS LLP

274 Madison Avenue - Suite 1703

New York, NY 10016

Tel. (212) 725-2450

Fax (212) 725-2452

Date: February 28, 2006